

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandran, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/534,153	06/16/2005	Nobuaki Tanaka	38204	1383	
52054 75070 04/14/2008 PEARNE & GORDON LLP 1801 EAST 97H STREET SUITE 1200 CLEVELAND, OH 44114-3108			EXAMINER		
			DABNEY, PHYLESHA LARVINIA		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				2614	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/14/2008	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patdocket@pearne.com dchervenak@pearne.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/534,153	TANAKA ET AL.		
Examiner		Art Unit		
	PHYLESHA L. DABNEY	2614		

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --THE REPLY FILED 03 March 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). **AMENDMENTS** 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 7. To purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: ___ Claim(s) rejected: _ Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: ___ AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. X The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). 13. Other:

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2614

//Curtis Kuntz//

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

With respect to the Specification objection, the admendment to the specification has been entered.

With respect to the objection to claim 12, the admendment to claim 12 to changed the status identifier has been entered.

With respect to claim 1, the Applicant argues that Steward does not teach conductor (shield can, 621) exposed from the bottom facing or side facing of the housing. The Examiner disagrees. Contrary to the Applicant's statements that the conductor is mounted in the case, but he does clearly show in several instances (figs. 1-6, specifically 6) the intention is to have the conductor exponsed/viewable at least at the side face. Therefore, the Examiner contends that Steward reference satisfies the claimed subject matter.

With respect to claims 6 and 9, the Applicant argues that Sadler does not teach a conductor part provided between a rear face of the casing and the circuit board. The Examiner disagrees. Since a casing comprises a front cover having a front and rear face, and a rear cover having a front and rear face, the Sadler reference teaches the conductor part (260, 360, 460, 560; protrusion as related to fig. 13, col. 7 ilines 63-67 wherein it states that the 1062 can be bridged by conductors) is provided between the rear face of the casing (1010) and the circuit board (1030) as shown in fig. 13. Therefore, the Examiner contends that Sadler reference satisfies the similar subject matter.

With respect to claims 7-8, the Applicant argues that Sadler does not teach the conductive board exposed from the rear face of the casing. The Examiner disagrees. Since a casing comprises a front cover having a front and rear face, and a rear cover having a front and rear face, the Sadler reference teaches the conductive board (1062) exposed/wewable from the rear face and front face of the front cover (153; col. 4 lines 10-14, the brand which is etched on the conductive board is visible, thus exposed from the rear face of the casing. Therefore, the Examiner contends that Sadler reference satisfies the claimed subject matter.